arXiv:math/0412403v1 [math.OC] 20 Dec 2004

Stochastic optimal control of delay equations arising in advertising models

Fausto Gozzi* and Carlo Marinelli†

December 6, 2004

Abstract

We consider a class of optimal control problems of stochastic delay differential equations (SDDE) that arise in connection with optimal advertising under uncertainty for the introduction of a new product to the market, generalizing classical work of Nerlove and Arrow [30]. In particular, we deal with controlled SDDE where the delay enters both the state and the control. Following ideas of Vinter and Kwong [34] (which however hold only in the deterministic case), we reformulate the problem as an infinite dimensional stochastic control problem to which we associate, through the dynamic programming principle, a second order Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation. We show a verification theorem and we exhibit some simple cases where such equation admits an explicit smooth solution, allowing us to construct optimal feedback controls.

1 Introduction

In this paper we consider a class of stochastic optimal control problems where the state equation is a stochastic delay differential equations (SDDE). Such problems arise for instance in modeling optimal advertising under uncertainty for the introduction of a new product to the market, generalizing classical work of Nerlove and Arrow [30]. The main novelty in our model is that we deal also with delays in the control: this is interesting from the applied point of view and introduces new mathematical difficulties in the problem.

Dynamic models in marketing have a long history, that begins at least with the seminal papers of Vidale and Wolfe [33] and Nerlove and Arrow [30]. Since then a considerable amount of work has been devoted to the extension of these models and to their application to problems of optimal advertising, both in the monopolistic and the competitive settings, mainly under deterministic assumptions. Models with uncertainty have received instead relatively less attention (see Feichtinger, Hartl, and Sethi [9] for a review of the existing work until 1994, Prasad and Sethi [31] for a Vidale and Wolf-like model in the competitive setting, and e.g. Grosset and Viscolani [21], Marinelli [29] for recent work on the case of a monopolistic firm). Moreover, it has been advocated in the literature (see e.g. Hartl [22], Feichtinger et al. [9] and references therein), as it reasonable to assume, that more realistic dynamic models of goodwill should allow for lags in the effect of advertisement. Namely, it is natural to assume that there will be a time lag between advertising expenditure and the corresponding effect on the goodwill level. More generally, a further lag structure has been considered, allowing a distribution of the forgetting time.

*Dipartimento di Scienze Economiche e Aziendali, Libera Università Internazionale degli Studi Sociali, Viale Pola 12, 00198 Roma (Italy).

†Institut für Angewandte Mathematik, Universität Bonn, Wegelerstr. 6, D-53115 Bonn (Germany).

In this work we incorporate both lag structures mentioned above. We formulate a stochastic optimal control problem aimed at maximizing the goodwill level at a given time horizon $T > 0$, while minimizing the cumulative cost of advertising expenditure until T.

This optimization problem is studied using techniques of stochastic optimal control in infinite dimension. In particular, we extend to the stochastic case a representation result, proved by Vinter and Kwong [34] in the deterministic setting, that allows to associate to a controlled SDDE with delays both in the state and in the control a stochastic differential equation (without delays) in a suitable Hilbert space. This in turn allows us to associate to the original control problem for the SDDE an equivalent (infinite dimensional) control problem for the "lifted" stochastic equation.

We deal with the resulting infinite dimensional optimal control problem through the dynamic programming approach, i.e. through the study of the associated Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation. The HJB equation that arise in this case is an infinite dimensional second order semilinear PDE that does not seem to fall into the ones treated in the existing literature (see Section 5 for details). Here we give some preliminary results for this equation. First of all we consider the particular case (but still interesting from the applied point of view) when the delay does not enter the control term. In this case the L^2 approach of Goldys and Gozzi [13] and the forward-backward SDE approach of Fuhrman and Tessitore [10], [12], [11] apply. We show how to apply the former in Section 4).

Moreover we consider the general case of delays in the state and in the control: since we do not know whether a regular solution exist, the natural approach would be the one of viscosity solutions. We leave the treatment of the viscosity solution approach to a subsequent work. Here we concentrate on the special case where regular solutions exist. In this case we prove a verification theorem and the existence of optimal feedbacks. Finally, we show through a simple example (but nevertheless still interesting in applications) that, possibly in special cases only, smooth solutions may exist, allowing to prove verification theorems and the existence of optimal feedback controls.

Some further steps are still needed to build a satisfactory theory: concerning the viscosity solutions theory, it would be important to get an existence and uniqueness result and a verification theorem; concerning regular solutions, other cases where further regularity may arise should be studied. These issues are part of work in progress.

As references on viscosity solutions of HJB equations in infinite dimensions, their connection with stochastic control and applications, we refer to e.g. Lions [26], [27], [28], Święch [32], Gozzi, Rouy, and Święch [17], Gozzi and Święch [19], Gozzi, Sritharan, and Święch [18].

Other approaches to optimal control problems for systems described by SDDEs without infinite dimensional reformulation have been proposed in the literature: for instance, see Elsanosi [6] and Larssen [24] for a more direct application of the dynamic programming principle without appealing to infinite dimensional analysis, and Kolmanovskiĭ and Shaĭkhet [23] for the linear-quadratic case. See also Elsanosi, Øksendal, and Sulem [8] for some solvable control problems of optimal harvesting, and Elsanosi and Larssen [7] for an application in financial mathematics.

The paper is organized as follows: in section 2 we formulate the optimal advertising problem as an optimal control problem for a SDDE with delays both in the state and the control. In section 3 we prove a representation result allowing us to "lift" this non-Markovian optimization problem to an infinite dimensional Markovian control problem. In section 4 we study the simpler case of a controlled SDDE with delays in the state only, for which known results apply. Section 5 deals with the general case of delays in the state and in the control, for which we only give the verification result. Finally, in section 6 we construct a simple example of a controlled SDDE with delay in the state and in the control, whose corresponding HJB equation admits a smooth solution, hence there exists an optimal control in feedback form for the control problem.

2 The advertising model

Our general reference model for the dynamics of the stock of advertising goodwill $y(s)$, $0 \le s \le T$, of the product to be launched is given by the following controlled stochastic delay differential equation (SDDE), where z models the intensity of advertising spending:

$$\begin{cases} dy(s) = \left[a_0 y(s) + \displaystyle\int_{-r}^{0} a_1(\xi) y(s+\xi)\, d\xi + b_0 z(s) + \int_{-r}^{0} b_1(\xi) z(s+\xi)\, d\xi \right] ds \\ \qquad\qquad +\sigma\, dW_0(s), \quad 0 \le s \le T \\ y(0) = \eta^0; \quad y(\xi) = \eta(\xi),\ z(\xi) = \delta(\xi) \ \ \forall \xi \in [-r, 0], \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

where the Brownian motion W_0 is defined on a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_s)_{s\ge 0}, \mathbb{P})$, with $\mathbb{F}$ being the completion of the filtration generated by W_0, and z belongs to $\mathcal{U} := L^2_{\mathbb{F}}([0,T]; \mathbb{R}^+)$, the space of square integrable non-negative processes adapted to $\mathbb{F}$. Moreover, we shall assume that the following conditions are verified:

(i) $a_0 \le 0$;

(ii) $a_1(\cdot) \in L^2([-r, 0]; \mathbb{R})$;

(iii) $b_0 \ge 0$;

(iv) $b_1(\cdot) \in L^2([-r, 0]; \mathbb{R}_+)$;

(v) $\eta^0 \ge 0$;

(vi) $\eta(\cdot) \ge 0$, with $\eta(0) = \eta^0$;

(vii) $\delta(\cdot) \ge 0$.

Here a_0 is a constant factor of image deterioration in absence of advertising, b_0 is a constant advertising effectiveness factor, $a_1(\cdot)$ is the distribution of the forgetting time, and $b_1(\cdot)$ is the density function of the time lag between the advertising expenditure z and the corresponding effect on the goodwill level. Moreover, η^0 is the level of goodwill at the beginning of the advertising campaign, $\eta(\cdot)$ and $\delta(\cdot)$ are the histories of the goodwill level and of the advertising expenditure, respectively, before time zero (one can assume $\eta(\cdot) = \delta(\cdot) = 0$, for instance). Note that when $a_1(\cdot)$, $b_1(\cdot)$, and σ are identically zero, equation (1) reduces to the classical model of Nerlove and Arrow [30].

Finally, we define the objective functional

$$J(z(\cdot)) = \mathbb{E}\left[\varphi_0(y(T)) - \int_0^T h_0(z(s))\, ds \right], \tag{2}$$

where φ_0 is a concave utility function with polynomial growth at infinity, h_0 is a convex cost function which is superlinear at infinity i.e.

$$\lim_{z \to +\infty} \frac{h(z)}{z} = +\infty,$$

and the dynamics of y is determined by (1). The problem we will deal with is the maximization of the objective functional J over all admissible controls in $\mathcal{U}$.

Remark 1 Note that in the general framework of delay equations the functions a_1 and b_1 are measures. Here we do not consider such general framework for two reasons: first taking a_1 and b_1 to be L^2 already captures the applied idea of the problem; second, taking a_1 and b_1 to be measures

would introduce some technical difficulties that we do not want to treat here. More precisely this would create some problems in the infinite dimensional reformulation bringing unbounded terms into the state equation. Indeed, if $b_1 \equiv 0$, the case where a_1 is a measure can be easily treated by a different standard reformulation. This fact allows us to treat the case of point delays in the state with no delays in the control. This will be the subject of section 4.

3 Reformulation in Hilbert space

Throughout the paper, X will be the Hilbert space defined as

$$X = \mathbb{R} \times L^2([-r, 0]; \mathbb{R}),$$

with inner product

$$\langle x, y \rangle = x_0 y_0 + \int_{-r}^{0} x_1(\xi) y_1(\xi)\, d\xi$$

and norm

$$|x| = \left(|x_0|^2 + \int_{-r}^{0} |x_1(\xi)|^2\, d\xi \right)^{1/2},$$

where x_0 and $x_1(\cdot)$ denote the $\mathbb{R}$-valued and the $L^2([-r, 0]; \mathbb{R})$-valued components, respectively, of the generic element x of X.

In this section we shall adapt the approach of Vinter and Kwong [34] to the stochastic case to recast the SDDE (1) as an abstract stochastic differential equation on the Hilbert space X and so to reformulate the optimal control problem.

We start by introducing an operator $A : D(A) \subset X \to X$ as follows:

$$A : (x_0, x_1(\xi)) \quad \mapsto \quad \left(a_0 x_0 + x_1(0), a_1(\xi) x_0 - \frac{dx_1(\xi)}{d\xi} \right) \quad \text{a.e. } \xi \in [-r, 0].$$

The domain of A is given by

$$D(A) = \left\{ (x_0, x_1(\cdot)) \in X : x_1(\cdot) \in W^{1,2}([-r, 0]; \mathbb{R}),\ x_1(-r) = 0 \right\}.$$

The operator A is the adjoint of the operator $A^* : D(A^*) \subset X \to X$ defined as

$$A^* : (x_0, x_1(\cdot)) \mapsto \left(a_0 x_0 + \int_{-r}^{0} a_1(\xi) x_1(\xi)\, d\xi, x_1'(\cdot) \right) \tag{3}$$

on

$$D(A^*) = \left\{ (x_0, x_1(\cdot)) \in \mathbb{R} \times W^{1,2}([-r, 0]; \mathbb{R}) : x_0 = x_1(0) \right\}.$$

It is well known that A^* is the infinitesimal generator of a strongly continuous semigroup (see, e.g., Chojnowska-Michalik [2] or Da Prato and Zabczyk [4]), therefore the same is true for A. We also need to define the bounded linear control operator $B : U \to X$ as

$$B : u \mapsto \Big(b_0 u, b_1(\cdot) u \Big), \tag{4}$$

where $U := \mathbb{R}_+$. Sometimes we shall identify the operator B with the element $(b_0, b_1(\cdot)) \in X$.

We introduce now an abstract stochastic differential equation on the Hilbert space X that is equivalent, in the sense made precise by Proposition 2, to the SDDE (1):

$$\begin{cases} dY(s) = (AY(s) + Bz(s))\, ds + G\, dW_0(s) \\ Y(0) = x \in X, \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

where $G : \mathbb{R} \to X$ is defined by

$$G : x_0 \to (\sigma x_0, 0),$$

and $z(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}$. Using theorems 5.4 and 5.9 in Da Prato and Zabczyk [3], we have that equation (5) admits a unique weak solution (in the sense of [3], p. 119) with continuous paths given by the variation of constants formula:

$$Y(s) = e^{sA}x + \int_0^s e^{(s-\tau)A}Bz(\tau)\,d\tau + \int_0^s e^{(s-\tau)A}G\,dW_0(\tau).$$

In order to state equivalence results between the SDDE (1) and the abstract evolution equation (5), we need to introduce the operator $M : X \times L^2([-r, 0]; \mathbb{R}) \to X$ defined as follows:

$$M : (x_0, x_1(\cdot), v(\cdot)) \mapsto (x_0, m(\cdot)),$$

where

$$m(\xi) := \int_{-r}^{\xi} a_1(\zeta)x_1(\zeta - \xi)\,d\zeta + \int_{-r}^{\xi} b_1(\zeta)v(\zeta - \xi)\,d\zeta.$$

The following result is a generalization of Theorems 5.1 and 5.2 of Vinter and Kwong [34].

Proposition 2 *Let $Y(\cdot)$ be the weak solution of the abstract evolution equation (5) with arbitrary initial datum $x \in X$ and control $z(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}$. Then, for $t \geq r$, one has, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.,*

$$Y(t) = M(Y_0(t), Y_0(t + \cdot), z(t + \cdot)).$$

Moreover, let $\{y(t),\ t \geq -r\}$ be a continuous solution of the stochastic delay differential equation (1), and $Y(\cdot)$ be the weak solution of the abstract evolution equation (5) with initial condition

$$x = M(\eta^0, \eta(\cdot), \delta(\cdot)).$$

Then, for $t \geq 0$, one has, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.,

$$Y(t) = M(y(t), y(t + \cdot), z(t + \cdot)),$$

hence $y(t) = Y_0(t)$, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s., for all $t \geq 0$.

Proof. Let $x = (x_0, x_1) \in D(A)$ (for general x the same result will follow by standard density arguments – see e.g. Vinter and Kwong [34]). Equation (5) can be written as

$$\begin{cases} dY_0(t) = \Big(a_0Y_0(t) + Y_1(t)(0) + b_0z(t)\Big)\,dt + \sigma\,dW_0(t) \\ dY_1(t)(\xi) = \Big(a_1(\xi)Y_0(t) - \dfrac{d}{d\xi}Y_1(t)(\xi) + b_1(\xi)z(t)\Big)\,dt, \\ Y_0(0) = x_0, \quad Y_1(0)(\cdot) = x_1(\cdot), \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

therefore, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.,

$$\begin{aligned} Y_0(t) &= e^{ta_0}x_0 + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)a_0}Y_1(s)(0)\,ds + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)a_0}b_0z(s)\,ds + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)a_0}\sigma\,dW_0(s) \\ Y_1(t)(\xi) &= [\Phi(t)x_1](\xi) + \int_0^t [\Phi(t-s)a_1(\cdot)Y_0(s)](\xi)\,ds + \int_0^t [\Phi(t-s)b_1(\cdot)z(s)](\xi)\,ds, \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where $\Phi(t)$ is the semigroup of truncated right shifts defined as

$$[\Phi(t)f(\cdot)](\xi) = \begin{cases} f(\xi - t), & -r \leq \xi - t \leq 0, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for all $f \in L^2$. Then (7) for $t \geq r$ can be rewritten, using the definition of Φ and recalling that $x_1(-r) = 0$, since $x \in D(A)$, as ($\mathbb{P}$-a.s.)

$$Y_1(t)(\xi) = \int_{-r}^{\xi} a_1(\alpha) Y_0(t + \alpha - \xi)\, d\alpha + \int_{-r}^{\xi} b_1(\alpha) z(t + \alpha - \xi)\, d\alpha, \tag{8}$$

which is equivalent to

$$Y(t) = M(Y_0(t), Y_0(t + \cdot), z(t + \cdot)),$$

as claimed.

Let us now prove the second claim: the L^2-valued component of the weak solution of the evolution equation (5) with initial data $Y(0) = x = M(\eta^0, \eta(\cdot), \delta(\cdot))$. satisfies, for $\xi - t \in [-r, 0]$, $\xi \in [-r, 0]$, $t \geq 0$,

$$Y_1(0)(\xi - t) = \int_{-r}^{\xi - t} a_1(\alpha) \eta(t + \alpha - \xi)\, d\alpha + \int_{-r}^{\xi - t} b_1(\alpha) \delta(t + \alpha - \xi)\, d\alpha,$$

$\mathbb{P}$-a.s., as follows from (7). We assume here $\eta(0) = \eta^0$, without loss of generality (the general case follows by density arguments, as in [34]). Again by (7) and some calculations we obtain, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.,

$$Y_1(t)(\xi) = \int_{-r}^{\xi} a_1(\alpha) \tilde{Y}_0(t + \alpha - \xi)\, d\alpha + \int_{-r}^{\xi} b_1(\alpha) z(t + \alpha - \xi)\, d\alpha,$$

where

$$\tilde{Y}_0(\xi) = \begin{cases} \eta(\xi), & \xi \in [-r, 0], \\ Y_0(\xi), & \xi \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

Observe that the definition of $\tilde{Y}$ is well posed because of the assumption $\eta(0) = \eta^0$, and because $\eta^0 = Y_0(0)$ by the definition of the operator M. In order to finish, we need to prove that $Y_0(\cdot)$ satisfies the same integral equation (in the mild sense) as the solution $y(\cdot)$ to the SDDE (1), i.e. that the following holds for all $t \geq 0$:

$$\int_0^t e^{(t-s)a_0} Y_1(s)(0)\, ds = \int_0^t e^{(t-s)a_0} \left[\int_{-r}^{0} a_1(\xi) Y_0(s + \xi)\, d\xi + \int_{-r}^{0} b_1(\xi) z(s + \xi)\, d\xi \right] ds.$$

But this follows immediately from (8) with $\xi = 0$:

$$Y_1(t)(0) = \int_{-r}^{0} a_1(\xi) Y_0(t + \xi)\, d\xi + \int_{-r}^{0} b_1(\xi) z(t + \xi)\, d\xi,$$

which proves the claim. The fact that $y(t) = Y_0(t)$, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s., for all $t \geq 0$, easily follows. ■

Using Proposition 2, we can now give a Hilbert space formulation of our problem. Since we want to use the dynamic programming approach, from now on we let the initial time vary, calling it t with $0 \leq t \leq T$.

The state space is $X = \mathbb{R} \times L^2([-r, 0]; \mathbb{R})$, the control space is $U = \mathbb{R}_+$, the control strategy is $z(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}$. The state equation is (5) with initial condition at t, i.e.

$$\begin{cases} dY(s) = (AY(s) + Bz(s))\, ds + G\, dW_0(s) \\ Y(t) = x \in X, \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

and its unique weak solution, given the initial data (t, x) and the control strategy $z(\cdot)$, will be denoted by $Y(\cdot; t, x, z(\cdot))$. The objective functional is

$$J(t, x; z(\cdot)) = \mathbb{E}^{t,x} \left[\varphi(Y(T, t, x; z(\cdot))) + \int_t^T h(z(s))\, ds \right]., \tag{10}$$

where the functions $h : U \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\varphi : X \to \mathbb{R}$ are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} h(z) &= -h_0(z) \\ \varphi(x_0, x_1(\cdot)) &= \varphi_0(x_0). \end{aligned}$$

The problem is to maximize the objective function $J(t, y; z(\cdot))$ over all $z(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}$. We also define the value function V for this problem as

$$V(t, x) = \inf_{z(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}} J(t, x; z(\cdot)).$$

Moreover, we shall say that $z^*(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}$ is an optimal control if it is such that

$$V(t, x) = J(t, x; z^*(\cdot)).$$

Following the dynamic programming approach we would like first to characterize the value function as the unique solution (in a suitable sense) of the following Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation

$$\begin{cases} v_t + \dfrac{1}{2}\operatorname{Tr}(Qv_{xx}) + \langle Ax, v_x\rangle + H_0(v_x) = 0 \\ v(T) = \varphi, \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

where $Q = G^*G$ and

$$H_0(p) = \sup_{z\in U}(\langle Bz, p\rangle + h(z)).$$

Moreover we would like to find a sufficient condition for optimality given in terms of V (a so-called verification theorem) and a feedback formula for the optimal control z^*.

4 The case with no delay in the control

In a model for the dynamics of goodwill with distributed forgetting factor, but without lags in the effect of advertising expenditure, i.e. with $b_1(\cdot) = 0$ in (1), it is possible to apply both the approach of Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations in L^2 spaces developed by Goldys and Gozzi [13], and the backward SDE approach of Fuhrman and Tessitore [11]. We follow here the first approach, showing that both the value function and the optimal advertising policy can be characterized in terms of the solution of a Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation in infinite dimension. In fact we treat a somewhat different case assuming that the distribution of the forgetting factor is concentrated on a point. This can be treated by a different standard reformulation and with simpler computations and interpretations. In particular, we consider the case where the goodwill evolves according to the following equation:

$$\begin{cases} dy(s) = [a_0 y(s) + a_1 y(s-r) + b_0 z_0(s)]\, ds + \sigma\, dW_0(s), \quad 0 \le s \le T \\ y(0) = \eta^0; \quad y(\xi) = \eta(\xi) \ \ \forall \xi \in [-r, 0]. \end{cases} \tag{12}$$

By the representation theorems for solutions of stochastic delay equations of Chojnowska-Michalik [2], one can associate to (12) an evolution equation on the Hilbert space X of the type

$$\begin{cases} dY(s) = (AY(s) + \sqrt{Q}z(s))\, ds + \sqrt{Q}\, dW(s), \\ Y(0) = y, \end{cases} \tag{13}$$

where $A : D(A) \subset X \to X$ is defined as

$$A : (x_0, x_1(\cdot)) \mapsto (a_0 x_0 + a_1 x_1(-r), x_1'(\cdot))$$

on its domain

$$D(A) = \left\{(x_0, x_1(\cdot)) \in (\mathbb{R} \times W^{1,2}([-r,0];\mathbb{R}) : x_0 = x_1(0)\right\};$$

moreover $z = (\sigma^{-1}b_0 z_0, z_1(\cdot)) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times L^2([-r,0];\mathbb{R})$, with $z_1(\cdot)$ a fictitious control; $Q : X \to X$ is defined as

$$Q : (x_0, x_1(\cdot)) \mapsto (\sigma^2 x_0, 0);$$

W is an X-valued cylindrical Wiener process with $W = (W_0, W_1)$, and W_1 is a (fictitious) cylindrical Wiener process taking values in $L^2([-r,0];\mathbb{R})$. Finally, $y = (\eta^0, \eta(\cdot))$.

Remark 3 Note that the operator A just introduced does not coincide with the A introduced in section 3. In fact, A here is exactly the A^* defined there . Similarly, the initial datum of this section differs from that of section 3. Note also that the reformulation carried out in this section does not extend to the more general case of delay in the control, explaining why the more elaborate construction of the previous section is needed.

We also note that the insertion of the fictitious control z_1 is not necessary here. We do it to keep the control space U equal to the state space X so the formulation falls into the results contained in Goldys and Gozzi [13]. However, it can be easily proved that the results of [13] still hold when the weaker condition $B(U) \subset Q^{\frac{1}{2}}(X)$ is satisfied.

The operator A is the infinitesimal generator of a strongly continuous semigroup $\{S(s), s \geq 0\}$ (see again Chojnowska-Michalik [2]). More precisely, one has

$$S(s)(x_0, x_1(\cdot)) = (y(s), y(s+\xi)|_{\xi\in[-r,0]}),$$

where $y(\cdot)$ is the solution of the deterministic delay equation

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{dy(s)}{dt} = a_0 y(s) + a_1 y(s-r), \quad 0 \leq s \leq T \\ y(0) = x_0; \quad y(\xi) = x_1(\xi) \ \ \forall \xi \in [-r,0]. \end{cases} \tag{14}$$

Moreover, the X-valued mild solution $Y(\cdot) = (Y_0(\cdot), Y_1(\cdot))$ of (13) is such that $Y_0(\cdot)$ solves the original stochastic delay equation (12).

As in section 3, we now consider an associated stochastic control problem letting the initial time t vary in $[0,T]$. The state equation is (13) with initial condition at t, i.e.

$$\begin{cases} dY(s) = (AY(s) + \sqrt{Q}z(s))\, ds + \sqrt{Q}\, dW(s), \\ Y(t) = x, \end{cases} \tag{15}$$

and the objective function is

$$J(t,x;z_0(\cdot)) = \mathbb{E}^{t,x}\left[\varphi_0(y(T)) - \int_t^T h_0(z_0(s))\, ds\right],$$

with $y(\cdot)$ obeying the SDDE (12). Defining

$$\begin{aligned} h(z_0, z_1(\cdot)) &= -h_0(z_0) \\ \varphi(x_0, x_1(\cdot)) &= \varphi_0(x_0), \end{aligned}$$

thanks to the above mentioned equivalence between the SDDE (12) and the abstract SDE (13), we are led to the equivalent problem of maximizing the objective function

$$J(t,x;z(\cdot)) = \mathbb{E}^{t,x}\left[\varphi(Y(T)) + \int_t^T h(z(s))\, ds\right], \tag{16}$$

with Y subject to (13).
Before doing so, however, following [13], we need to assume conditions on the coefficients of (12) such that the uncontrolled version of (13), i.e.

$$\begin{cases} dZ(t) = AZ(t)\,dt + \sqrt{Q}\,dW(t), \\ Z(0) = x, \end{cases} \tag{17}$$

admits an invariant measure. It is known (see Da Prato and Zabczyk [4]) that

$$a_0 < 1, \quad a_0 < -a_1 < \sqrt{\gamma^2 + a_0^2}, \tag{18}$$

where $\gamma \coth \gamma = a_0$, $\gamma \in]0, \pi[$, ensures that (17) admits a unique non-degenerate invariant measure μ.

Remark 4 The deterioration factor a_0 is always assumed to be negative, hence the first condition in (18) is not a real constraint. In general, however, it is not clear what sign a_1 should have. If a_1 is also negative, i.e. it can again be interpreted as a deterioration factor, condition (18) says that a_1 cannot be "much more negative" than a_0. On the other hand, if a_1 is positive, then the second condition in (18) implies that the improvement effect as measured by a_1 cannot exceed the deterioration effect as measured by $|a_0|$.

Let us now define the Hamiltonian $H_0 : X \to \mathbb{R}$ as

$$H_0(p) = \sup_{z \in U} \left(\langle \sqrt{Q} z, p \rangle_X + h(z) \right)$$

and write the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation associated to the control problem (16):

$$\begin{cases} v_t + \dfrac{1}{2} \operatorname{Tr}(Q v_{xx}) + \langle Ax, v_x \rangle + H_0(v_x) = 0 \\ v(T, x) = \varphi(x). \end{cases} \tag{19}$$

If the Hamiltonian H_0 is Lipschitz (which follows from the hypothesis on h_0), $\varphi \in L^2(X, \mu)$ (which follows from the hypothesis on φ), and the operator A satisfies (18), then (19) admits a unique mild solution v in the space $L^2(0, T; W_Q^{1,2}(X, \mu))$, as follows from Theorem 3.7 of [13]. Moreover, Theorem 5.7 of ibid. guarantees that v coincides (μ-a.e.) with the value function

$$V(t, x) = \inf_{z \in \mathcal{U}} \mathbb{E}^{t,x} \left[\varphi(Y(T)) + \int_t^T h(z(s))\,ds \right]$$

(by $z \in \mathcal{U}$ we mean, with a slight abuse of notation, $z_0 \in \mathcal{U}$), and that there exists a unique optimal control z^*, i.e.

$$V(t, x) = J(t, x; z^*(\cdot))$$

with

$$z^*(t) = DH(\widetilde{D}_Q v(t, Y^*(t))), \tag{20}$$

and Y^* is the solution of the closed-loop equation

$$\begin{cases} dY(s) = [AY(s) + \sqrt{Q} DH(\widetilde{D}_Q v(s, Y(s))]\,ds + \sqrt{Q}\,dW(t) \\ Y(t) = x. \end{cases} \tag{21}$$

The gradient operator $\widetilde{D}_Q$ is, roughly speaking, a "weakly closable" extension of the Malliavin derivative $Q^{1/2}D$ acting on $W_Q^{1,2}(X, \mu)$. For the exact definition and construction of $\widetilde{D}_Q$ we refer the reader to [13].

Remark 5 The HJB equation (19) is "genuinely" infinite dimensional, i.e. it reduces to a finite dimensional one only in very special cases. For example, by the results of Larssen and Risebro [25], (19) reduces to a finite dimensional PDE if and only if $a_0 = -a_1$. However, under this assumption, we cannot guarantee the existence of a non-degenerate invariant measure for the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroup associated to (17). Even more extreme would be the situation of distributed forgetting time: in this case the HJB is finite dimensional only if the term accounting for distributed forgetting vanishes altogether!

5 Delays in the state and in the control

We now consider the case when also delays in the control are present. The optimal control problem is the one described in section 2 with $a_1(\cdot) \neq 0$, $b_1(\cdot) \neq 0$.

The Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation associated to the problem is

$$\begin{cases} v_t + \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{Tr}(Qv_{xx}) + \langle Ax, v_x\rangle + H_0(v_x) = 0 \\ v(T) = \varphi, \end{cases} \tag{22}$$

where $Q = G^*G$ and

$$H_0(p) = \sup_{z\in U}(\langle Bz, p\rangle + h(z)).$$

Unfortunately it is not possible, in general, to obtain regular solutions of the HJB equation (22) using the existing theory based on perturbations of Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroups (see e.g. Barbu and Da Prato [1], Da Prato and Zabczyk [5] and Gozzi [15], [16]). The main problem is the lack of regularity properties of a suitable Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroup associated to the problem: in particular, the associated gradient operator is not closable and the semigroup is not strongly Feller (see Goldys and Gozzi [13] and Goldys, Gozzi, and van Neerven [14]).

As mentioned in section 4, if there is no lag in the effect of advertisement spending on the goodwill, i.e. if $b_1(\cdot) = 0$, then both the L^2 approach of Goldys and Gozzi [13] and the backward SDE approach of Fuhrman and Tessitore [11] can be applied, obtaining a characterization of the value function and of the optimal advertising policy in terms of the (unique) solution to (22). Both approaches, however, fail in this more general case, since they require, roughly speaking, that the image of the control is included in the image of the noise, i.e. that $B(U) \subseteq G(X)$, which is clearly not true.

The only approach that seems to work in the general case of delays in the state and in the control is, to the best of our knowledge, the framework of viscosity solutions (see Lions [26], [27], [28]). However, while this approach gives a characterization of the value function in terms of the unique (viscosity) solution of the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation (22), this solution is only guaranteed to be continuous, hence one can construct from it an optimal control only in a rather weak form, through the so called viscosity verification theorems (see Gozzi, Swiech, and Zhou [20]). The study of this problem in the framework of viscosity solutions is the subject of a forthcoming publication.

Here we want to prove a verification theorem in the case when regular solutions of the HJB equation are available.

Definition 6 *A function v is said to be*

- *a* classical solution *of the HJB equation (22) if $v \in C^{1,2}([0,T]\times X)$ and v satisfies (22) pointwise;*

- *an* integral solution *if* $v \in C^{0,2}([0,T] \times X)$*, and moreover for* $t \in [0,T]$ *and* $x \in D(A)$*, one has*

$$\varphi(x) - v(t,x) + \int_t^T \left[\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Tr}(Q v_{xx}(s,x)) + \langle Ax, v_x(s,x) \rangle + H_0(v_x(s,x)) \right] ds = 0 \tag{23}$$

Theorem 7 (Verification Theorem) *Let* v *be an integral solution of the HJB (22) and let* V *be the value function of the optimal control problem. Then*

(i) $v \geq V$ *on* $[0,T] \times X$*.*

(ii) If a control $z \in \mathcal{U}$ *is such that, at starting point* (t,x)*,*

$$H_0(v_x(s,Y(s))) = \sup_{z \in U} \{ \langle Bz, v_x(s,Y(s)) \rangle + h(z) \} = \langle Bz(s), v_x(s,Y(s)) \rangle + h(z(s))$$

for almost every $s \in [t,T]$*,* $\mathbb{P}$*-a.e., then this control is optimal and* $v(t,x) = V(t,x)$*.*

(iii) If we know a priori that $V = v$*, then (ii) is a necessary (and sufficient) condition of optimality.*

Although there is a standard way to prove such results, this version of the verification theorem is not contained in the existing literature.

We give an idea of the method by sketching the proof in the case of bounded A. The case of unbounded A can be treated by approximating A with its Yosida approximations A_n, and then passing to the limit as $n \to +\infty$ (see e.g. Barbu and Da Prato [1]).

Proof. Let A and B be bounded operators. The core of the job is to prove that, for every $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times X$ and any $z \in \mathcal{U}$ the following fundamental identity holds

$$v(t,x) = J(t,x;z(\cdot)) + \int_t^T \left[H_0(v_x(s,Y(s))) - \langle Bz(s), v_x(s,Y(s)) \rangle - h(z(s)) \right] ds, \tag{24}$$

where $Y(s) := Y(s;t,x;z(\cdot))$. Once this is proved, the three claims of the theorem follow as straightforward consequences of the definitions of the Hamiltonian H_0, of value function and of optimal strategy.

Let us then prove (24). We first approximate v by a sequence of smooth function v_n that solve suitable approximating equations and that are such that

$$v_n \longrightarrow v, \qquad v_{nx} \longrightarrow v_x.$$

This is possible e.g. using the same ideas of Goldys and Gozzi [13], Section 4. Then for a.e. $s \in ([t,T] \cap \mathbb{R})$, one may show that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{ds} v_n(s,Y(s)) &= v_{nt}(s,Y(s)) + \langle y'(s), v_{nx}(s,Y(s)) \rangle & (25) \\ &= v_{nt}(s,Y(s)) + \langle AY(s) + Bz(s), v_{nx}(s,Y(s)) \rangle. & (26) \end{aligned}$$

Since v_n is a classical solution of a suitable approximating HJB equation (see again [13]), we have

$$v_{nt}(s,Y(s)) + \langle AY(s), v_{ns}(s,Y(s)) \rangle = -H_0(B^* v_{nx}(s,Y(s))) - g_n(s,Y(s)),$$

where g_n is a term appearing in the approximating HJB such that $g_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ (see again [13]). Substituting in (26) and then adding and subtracting $h(s,z(s))$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{ds} v_n(s,Y(s)) &= \langle z(s), B^* v_{nx}(s,Y(s)) \rangle - H_0(B^* v_{nx}(s,Y(s))) - g_n(s,Y(s)) \\ &= \langle z(s), B^* v_{nx}(s,Y(s)) \rangle + h(z(s)) \\ &\quad - H_0(B^* v_{nx}(s,Y(s))) - g_n(s,Y(s)) - h(z(s)). \end{aligned}$$

Integrating between t and T we get

$$\begin{aligned} & v_n\left(T, Y\left(T\right)\right) - v_n\left(t, x\right) + \int_t^T \left[g_n\left(s, Y\left(s\right)\right) + h(z(s))\right] ds \\ = & \int_t^T \left[\langle z(s), B^*(v_{nx}(s, Y(s)))\rangle + h(z(s)) - H_0(B^* v_{nx}(s, Y(s)))\right] ds, \end{aligned}$$

which gives the desired equality (24) after passing to the limit as $n \to \infty$. ■

About feedback maps, the following theorem holds true.

Theorem 8 *Under the same hypotheses of theorem 7, assume that there exists a measurable map $\Gamma : ([0,T] \cap \mathbb{R}) \times X \to U$, such that $\Gamma\left(t,p\right)$ is a maximum point of the map $z \mapsto \langle z, B^*p\rangle + h(z)$ for given $(t,p) \in ([0,T] \cap \mathbb{R}) \times X$. Assume also that for every (t,x) there exists a (mild) solution $Y^*\left(\cdot\right)$ of the closed loop equation*

$$\begin{cases} dY^*(\tau) = AY^*(\tau) + B\Gamma(\tau, v_x(\tau, Y^*(\tau))) + G\, dW(t), & \tau \in [t,T] \cap \mathbb{R}; \\ Y^*(t) = x, & x \in X, \end{cases}$$

such that $\tau \mapsto \Gamma(\tau, v_x(\tau, Y^*(\tau)))$ belongs to $\mathcal{U}$. Then the couple $(Y^*(\cdot), z^*(\cdot))$ is optimal whenever the control strategy satisfies the feedback relation

$$z^*\left(\tau\right) = \Gamma\left(\tau, v_x\left(\tau, Y^*\left(\tau\right)\right)\right).$$

Proof. This is a straightforward consequence of (ii) in the Verification Theorem, as the control generated by the feedback relation satisfies (ii). ■

6 An example with explicit solution

Here we restrict ourselves to some less general specification of the objective function, but still meaningful, for which the HJB equation admits a smooth solution, and therefore the value function and the optimal control can be completely characterized.

Let us assume

$$h(z) = -\beta z_0^2$$

and

$$\varphi(x) = \gamma x_0,$$

with β, $\gamma > 0$. Then we have

$$H_{CV}(p,z) = \langle Bz, p\rangle + h(z) = \langle B, p\rangle z - \beta z^2,$$

and

$$H_0(p) = \sup_{z \in U} H_{CV}(z,p) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{\langle B,p\rangle^2}{4\beta}, & \langle B,p\rangle \geq 0 \\ 0, & \langle B,p\rangle < 0, \end{cases}$$

or equivalently, in more compact notation,

$$H_0(p) = \frac{(\langle B,p\rangle^+)^2}{4\beta}.$$

We conjecture a solution of the HJB equation (22) of the form

$$v(t,x) = \langle w(t), x\rangle + c(t), \qquad t \in [0,T],\ x \in X,$$

where $w(\cdot) : [0,T] \to X$ and $c(\cdot) : [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}$ are given functions whose properties we will study below. Hence for $t \in [0,T]$ and $x \in X$ we have, assuming that all objects are well defined,

$$\begin{aligned} v_t(t,x) &= \langle w'(t), x\rangle + c'(t) \\ v_x(t,x) &= w(t) \\ v_{xx} &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \langle w'(t), x\rangle + c'(t) + \langle Ax, w\rangle + \dfrac{(\langle B, w(t)\rangle^+)^2}{4\beta} = 0, & t \in [0,T),\ x \in X, \\ \langle w(T), x\rangle + c(T) = \gamma x_0, & x \in X. \end{cases} \tag{27}$$

It is clear that, if $A^*w(t)$ is well defined for all $t \in [0,T]$, (27) is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} \langle w'(t), x\rangle + \langle A^*w(t), x\rangle = 0, & t \in [0,T[\\ w(T) = (\gamma, 0) \end{cases} \tag{28}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} c'(t) + \dfrac{(\langle B, w(t)\rangle^+)^2}{4\beta} = 0, & t \in [0,T[\\ c(T) = 0. \end{cases} \tag{29}$$

Since (28) must hold for all x, then it implies

$$\begin{cases} w'(t) + A^*w(t) = 0, & t \in [0,T[\\ w(T) = (\gamma, 0). \end{cases}$$

Recalling (3), we obtain that (28) is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} w_0'(t) + a_0 w_0(t) + \displaystyle\int_{-r}^{0} a_1(\xi) w_1(t,\xi)\, d\xi = 0, & t \in [0,T[\\ w_0(T) = \gamma \end{cases} \tag{30}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial w_1}{\partial t}(t,\xi) + \dfrac{\partial w_1}{\partial \xi}(t,\xi) = 0, & t \in [0,T[,\ \xi \in [-r,0[\\ w_1(T,\xi) = 0, & \xi \in [-r,0[\\ w_1(t,0) = w_0(t), & t \in [0,T]. \end{cases} \tag{31}$$

The solution of (31) is given by

$$w_1(t,\xi) = w_0(t-\xi)\mathbb{I}_{\{t-\xi \in [0,T]\}}, \tag{32}$$

from which one can solve equation (30), obtaining $w_0(\cdot)$. Note that, unfortunately, the function w is never in $D(A^*)$, except for the case when it is 0 everywhere. However this does not exclude that the candidate $v(t,x) = \langle w(t), x\rangle + c(t)$ solves the HJB equation (22) in some sense. Indeed it is an integral solution of (22) in the sense of definition (6), as it follows from the above calculations. Note that $v \in C([0,T] \times X)$ and that it is twice differentiable in the x variable, i.e. it satisfies the

hypotheses of the verification theorem 7. Since a maximizer of the current-value Hamiltonian is given by $z^* = \langle B, p\rangle^+/(2\beta)$, then it is immediately seen that the control

$$z^*(t) = \frac{\langle B, v_x(t)\rangle^+}{2\beta} = \frac{\langle B, w(t)\rangle^+}{2\beta}, \qquad t \in [0,T],$$

which does not depend on $Y^*(t)$, is admissible, hence (ii) of the verification theorem 7 holds, and $z^*(\cdot)$ is optimal.

References

[1] V. Barbu and G. Da Prato. *Hamilton-Jacobi Equations in Hilbert Spaces*. Pitman, London, 1983.

[2] A. Chojnowska-Michalik. Representation theorem for general stochastic delay equations. *Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci. Sér. Sci. Math. Astronom. Phys.*, 26(7):635–642, 1978.

[3] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk. *Stochastic equations in infinite dimensions*. Cambridge UP, 1992.

[4] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk. *Ergodicity for infinite-dimensional systems*. Cambridge UP, 1996.

[5] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk. *Second order partial differential equations in Hilbert spaces*. Cambridge UP, 2002.

[6] I. Elsanosi. Stochastic control for systems with memory. Dr. Scient. thesis, University of Oslo, 2000.

[7] I. Elsanosi and B. Larssen. Optimal consumption under partial observation for a stochastic system with delay. Preprint, University of Oslo, 2001.

[8] I. Elsanosi, B. Øksendal, and A. Sulem. Some solvable stochastic control problems with delay. *Stochastics Stochastics Rep.*, 71(1-2):69–89, 2000.

[9] G. Feichtinger, R. Hartl, and S. Sethi. Dynamical Optimal Control Models in Advertising: Recent Developments. *Management Sci.*, 40:195–226, 1994.

[10] M. Fuhrman and G. Tessitore. Nonlinear Kolmogorov equations in infinite dimensional spaces: the backward stochastic differential equations approach and applications to optimal control. *Ann. Probab.*, 30(3):1397–1465, 2002.

[11] M. Fuhrman and G. Tessitore. Generalized directional gradients, backward stochastic differential equations and mild solutions of semilinear parabolic equations. Preprint, Politecnico di Milano, 2003.

[12] M. Fuhrman and G. Tessitore. Infinite horizon backward stochastic differential equations and elliptic equations in Hilbert spaces. *Ann. Probab.*, 32(1B):607–660, 2004.

[13] B. Goldys and F. Gozzi. Second order parabolic HJ equations in Hilbert spaces and stochastic control: L^2 approach. Working paper.

[14] B. Goldys, F. Gozzi, and J. M. A. M. van Neerven. On closability of directional gradients. *Potential Anal.*, 18(4):289–310, 2003.

[15] F. Gozzi. Regularity of solutions of a second order Hamilton-Jacobi equation and application to a control problem. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 20(5-6):775–826, 1995.

[16] F. Gozzi. Global regular solutions of second order Hamilton-Jacobi equations in Hilbert spaces with locally Lipschitz nonlinearities. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 198(2):399–443, 1996.

[17] F. Gozzi, E. Rouy, and A. Święch. Second order Hamilton-Jacobi equations in Hilbert spaces and stochastic boundary control. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 38(2):400–430 (electronic), 2000. ISSN 1095-7138.

[18] F. Gozzi, S. S. Sritharan, and A. Święch. Bellman equations associated to the optimal feedback control of stochastic Navier-Stokes equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, to appear.

[19] F. Gozzi and A. Święch. Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations for the optimal control of the Duncan-Mortensen-Zakai equation. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 172(2):466–510, 2000.

[20] F. Gozzi, A. Swiech, and X. Y. Zhou. A corrected proof of the stochastic verification theorem within the framework of viscosity solutions. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, to appear.

[21] L. Grosset and B. Viscolani. Advertising for a new product introduction: a stochastic approach. Preprint, Università di Padova, 2003.

[22] R. F. Hartl. Optimal dynamic advertising policies for hereditary processes. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, 43(1):51–72, 1984.

[23] V. B. Kolmanovskiĭ and L. E. Shaĭkhet. *Control of systems with aftereffect*. AMS, Providence, RI, 1996.

[24] B. Larssen. Dynamic programming in stochastic control of systems with delay. *Stoch. Stoch. Rep.*, 74(3-4):651–673, 2002.

[25] B. Larssen and N. H. Risebro. When are HJB-equations in stochastic control of delay systems finite dimensional? *Stochastic Anal. Appl.*, 21(3):643–671, 2003.

[26] P.-L. Lions. Viscosity solutions of fully nonlinear second-order equations and optimal stochastic control in infinite dimensions. I. The case of bounded stochastic evolutions. *Acta Math.*, 161(3-4):243–278, 1988.

[27] P.-L. Lions. Viscosity solutions of fully nonlinear second order equations and optimal stochastic control in infinite dimensions. II. Optimal control of Zakai's equation. In *Stochastic partial differential equations and applications, II (Trento, 1988)*, volume 1390 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 147–170. Springer, Berlin, 1989.

[28] P.-L. Lions. Viscosity solutions of fully nonlinear second-order equations and optimal stochastic control in infinite dimensions. III. Uniqueness of viscosity solutions for general second-order equations. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 86(1):1–18, 1989.

[29] C. Marinelli. The stochastic goodwill problem. arXiv:math.OC/0310316, 2003.

[30] M. Nerlove and J. K. Arrow. Optimal advertising policy under dynamic conditions. *Economica*, 29:129–142, 1962.

[31] A. Prasad and S. P. Sethi. Dynamic optimization of an oligopoly model of advertising. Preprint, 2003.

[32] A. Święch. "Unbounded" second order partial differential equations in infinite-dimensional Hilbert spaces. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 19(11-12):1999–2036, 1994.

[33] M. L. Vidale and H. B. Wolfe. An operations-research study of sales response to advertising. *Operations Res.*, 5:370–381, 1957.

[34] R. B. Vinter and R. H. Kwong. The infinite time quadratic control problem for linear systems with state and control delays: an evolution equation approach. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 19 (1):139–153, 1981.